1 2 3 4 5 6 7	CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS Mark Potter, Esq., SBN 166317 Phyl Grace, Esq., SBN 171771 Dennis Price, SBN 279082 Mail: PO Box 262490 San Diego, CA 92196-2490 Delivery: 9845 Erma Road, Suite 300 San Diego, CA 92131 (858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax phylg@potterhandy.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs		
8 9 10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
11	Chris Langer,	Case: 3:14-CV-00816-BEN-KSC	
12	Plaintiff,	First Amended Complaint For	
13	V.	First Amended Complaint For Damages And Injunctive Relief For Violations Of: American's	
1415161718	H. Jeannie Napolitano, in her individual and representative capacity as trustee of the Napolitano Family Survivors Trust; Delux Dogs, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company; and Does 1-10,	With Disabilities Act; Unruh Civil Rights Act; California Disabled Persons Act; Negligence	
19	Defendants.		
20 21 22 23 24	Plaintiff Chris Langer complains of Defendants H. Jeannie Napolitano, in her individual and representative capacity as trustee of the Napolitano Family Survivors Trust; Delux Dogs, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company; and Does 1-10 ("Defendants") and alleges as follows:		
25262728	PARTIES: 1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. He is a paraplegic who cannot walk and who uses a wheelchair for mobility. He has a specially equipped van with a ramp that deploys out of the passenger side		
	1		

- of his van and he has a Disabled Person Parking Placard issued to him by the State of California.
- 2. Defendant Delux Dogs, LLC owns and operates Delux Dogs ("Restaurant") located at or about 943 Orange Avenue, Coronado, California, now and did so in March 2014.
- 3. Defendant H. Jeannie Napolitano, in her individual and representative capacity as trustee of the Napolitano Family Survivors Trust, owns the property located at or about 943 Orange Avenue, Coronado, California, now and did so in March 2014.
- 4. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of, and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein, including Does 1 through 10, inclusive, is responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a necessary party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants and Does 1 through 10, inclusive, are ascertained.

JURISDICTION & VENUE:

- 5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.
- 6. Pursuant to pendant jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of the same transactions, is also brought under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act, and the California Disabled Persons Act, which acts expressly

incorporate the Americans with Disabilities Act.

7. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and is founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is located in this district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this district.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:

- 8. The Plaintiff went to the Restaurant in March of 2014, to eat.
- 9. The Restaurant is a facility open to the public, a place of public accommodation, and a business establishment.
- 10. Parking spaces are one of the facilities, privileges and advantages offered by defendants to their customers at the Restaurant.
- 11. Unfortunately, there are no accessible, compliant parking spaces available for disabled customers at the Restaurant.
- 12. Rather, there is a parking space reserved for disabled customers but there is no access aisle that accompanies the parking space. As a result, it is not useable or functional for plaintiff.
- 13. Plaintiff, on information and belief, alleges that a fully accessible handicap parking space once existed at this location, however.
- 14. But, because defendants have no policy or procedure to maintain their parking spaces, the previous parking space and access aisle serving the disabled community has faded beyond oblivion or been paved over.
- 15. The plaintiff personally encountered this problem. This inaccessible condition denied the plaintiff full and equal access and caused him difficulty.
- 16. Additionally, on information and belief, the plaintiff alleges that the failure to remove these barriers was intentional because: (1) these particular barriers are intuitive and obvious; (2) the defendants exercised control and dominion over the conditions at this location and, therefore, the lack of

accessible facilities was not an "accident" because had the defendants intended any other configuration, they had the means and ability to make the change.

4

I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990 (On behalf of plaintiffs and against all defendants (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)

9

17. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.

11

18. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods and services of any place of public accommodation is offered on a full and equal basis by anyone who owns, leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a). Discrimination is defined, inter alia, as follows:

15

a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford facilities, privileges, goods, services. advantages, accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).

19

b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are defined by reference to the ADAAG, found at 28 C.F.R., Part

24

36, Appendix "D."

26

25

c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities,

including individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

- 19. Any business that provides parking spaces must provide handicap parking spaces. 1991 Standards § 4.1.2(5). One in every eight of those handicap parking spaces but not less than one must be a "van" accessible parking space, *i.e.*, having an eight foot access aisle. 1991 Standards § 4.1.2(5)(b).
- 20. Here, there was no accessible parking because, while there was a dedicated parking space for disabled customers, there was no access aisle accompanying the parking space. The lack of an access aisle is a violation of the law.
- 21. Plaintiff, on information and belief, alleges that a fully compliant parking space once existed at this location.
- 22. However, the defendants have no policy or procedure to maintain their parking spaces so that they do not fade beyond oblivion or get paved over.
- 23. The Defendants are persons who own, operate, lease or lease to a place of public accommodation. As such, the Defendants are required to ensure that persons with disabilities are not discriminated against and, additionally, have specific duties to (1) ensure that all construction, alteration, or modification is barrier free and complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines ("ADAAG"); and/or (2) remove all existing barriers where such removal is "readily achievable," and/or (3) to provide alternatives to barrier removal. The Defendants have failed to meet these obligations.

1 II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH 2 **CIVIL RIGHTS ACT** (On behalf of plaintiffs and against all defendants) 3 (Cal Civ § 51-53) 4 24. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth 5 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this 6 complaint. 7 25. Because the defendants violated the plaintiffs' rights under the ADA, 8 they also violated the Unruh Civil Rights Act and are liable for damages. (Civ. Code § 51(f), 52(a).) 9 10 26. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in 11 difficulty, discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiffs, the defendants are 12 also each responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Civ. Code § 13 55.56(a)-(c).) 14 15 **ACTION: VIOLATION** III. **THIRD** CAUSE **OF** OF THE 16 CALIFORNIA DISABLED PERSONS ACT (On behalf of plaintiffs and 17 against all defendants) (Cal Civ.§ 54-54.8) 18 27. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth 19 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this 20 complaint. 21 28. Because the defendants violated the plaintiff's rights under the ADA, 22 they also violated the Disabled Persons Act and are liable for damages. (Civ. 23 Code § 54.1(d), 54.3(a).) 24 29. Because the violation of the Disabled Persons Act resulted in 25 difficulty, discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiffs, the defendants are 26 also each responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Civ. Code § 27 55.56(a)-(c).) 28

7

8 9 10

11

12

13 14

16 17

15

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- IV. FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION: NEGLIGENCE (On behalf of plaintiff and against all defendants)
- 30. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.
- 31. The Defendants had a general duty and a duty arising under the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act and California Disabled Persons Act to provide safe, convenient, and accessible facilities to the plaintiffs. Their breach of this duty, as alleged in the preceding paragraphs, has caused injury and damage as alleged above.

PRAYER:

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this court award damages and provide relief as follows:

- 1. For injunctive relief, compelling defendants to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the Plaintiffs are not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all.
- 2. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act and/or the California Disabled Persons Act which damages provide for actual damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000. Note: a plaintiff cannot recover under both acts, simultaneously, and an election will be made prior to or at trial.

1	3. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit,	
2	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; Cal. Civ. Code §§ 52 and 54.3.	
3	D + 1 A '100 2014	CENTED FOR DIGARILITY ACCESS
4	Dated: April 28, 2014	CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS
5		
6		By:
7		Mark Potter, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiff
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		